

Re Box No V.

100570914
IAP20 REC'D FEB 10 03 MAR 2005

1. In this opinion reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : CAMARILLO G ET AL: "Draft-ietf-sip-isup-03.txt: ISUP to SIP mapping"
IETF INTERNET DRAFT, August 2001 (2001-08), XP002254297 INTERNET

D2 : US 2003/104812 A1 (EASLEY LARRY SCOTT) June 5, 2003 (2003-06-05)
D3 : WO 01/10140 A (MCI WORLDCOM INC) February 8, 2001 (2001-02-08)

2. Document D1 is regarded as the nearest prior art. It discloses:

- ◊ a method for supporting different features with TDM networks connected to SIP CENTREX configurations, whereby the relevant information for the features can be transmitted in several, differing information elements of a transmission protocol
- ◊ whereby a mapping is carried out between the information elements of the transmission protocol and those of a SIP protocol
- ◊ and whereby, in accordance with subscriber related information, the information elements of the SIP protocol are suppressed or approved,

from which the subject matter of the independent claim 1 differs in that:

- ◊ it concerns the "Name Delivery" feature
- ◊ the relevant information for the feature is name information

- 2.1 The subject matter of claim 1 thus appears to be novel (Article 33 (2) PCT).

The object to be achieved with the present invention can thus be seen as to show how the "Name Delivery" feature can also be used with mixed TDM configurations/SIP CENTREX configurations.

- 2.2 The solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application for this object is based on an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT). None of the documents quoted in the international search report discloses the possibility of using the "Name Delivery" feature in mixed TDM/SIP networks as well.

Both D1 and D3 disclose a method for displaying the telephone number of the caller in mixed networks, but the possibility of displaying name information is not described.

D2 does show a method for displaying the name of the caller on the display of the person called, but this is only for mobile communication networks and not for mixed TDM/SIP networks and the lesson of this disclosure could not be transposed onto mixed networks.

- 2.3 The claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1 and thus likewise fulfil the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step.

Re Box No VII.

1. D1 should be mentioned in the description (Rule 5.1 (a)(ii) PCT).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International reference
PCT/EP2004/051957

If new independent claims are submitted, then they should be in the two-part form opposite **D1** (Rule 6.3(b) PCT).

Re Box No VIII.

1. The claims 1 -3 and 7 are not clear and do not fulfil the requirements of the Article 6 PCT in as far as the subject matter that the application for protection is desired for is not clearly defined. If text in brackets is added to the claims this results in a lack of clarity as it is not clear whether the features added in brackets limit the scope of the claim or if they are to be understood as reference characters (Rule 6.2 b PCT).